

February 8, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A609

rather a so-called union of many nations. Legally, there is no such animal as a "Soviet national" other than a fictional image in the minds of some who wallow in the myths of the U.S.S.R. being a nation or anyone in the U.S.S.R.—worse still "Russia"—being a "Soviet," which is a council of workers and peasants.

Clearly, if some can extricate themselves from the unreasoned, semantic mess indicated here, they would begin to see that the convention contradicts the very essence of the U.S.S.R. Constitution, which though largely semantic is nonetheless a nominal compromise with the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. By this kind of misrepresentative language the pact violates also the authenticity of every official map of the U.S.S.R. and contradicts reams of official Moscow pronouncements on the multi-national composition of the U.S.S.R. In their desire to reap the psychopolitical advantages of the treaty the Muscovite rulers would prostitute anything and, as in everything else, accuse the other party of the perversions. By allowing this to take place we exhibit our own psychopolitical immaturity.

Further examples of legal invalidity are, in the case of the Soviet Union, provisions for "the national flag of the sending state" and "the national coat-of-arms of the sending state."⁶ Of course, in objective circumstance there is no such flag or coat-of-arms for the U.S.S.R. Each republic has its own flag and emblem. The flag and coat-of-arms of the U.S.S.R. shown at any Moscow-established consulate in the United States would be another perversion of fact permitted by the legal invalidity of the treaty.

Speaking of legalities, no one has raised the question of accumulated legacies left by Russian emigrés and others in behalf of known or unknown parties in the U.S.S.R. How many millions of dollars is colonialist Moscow seeking to acquire under article 10 of the treaty? The Russians are employing every trick, including "the economic independence of the satellites," to build up their stock of foreign currencies; the treaty is another means. It would be interesting to see what the Department of State can furnish on these accumulated legacies. Mr. Rusk and others vaguely argue that the pact would abet "mutual understanding." With whom? The imperio-colonialists in Moscow? What of the various nations and peoples in the U.S.S.R.? How would all these allowed perversions and open risks mould our bonds of mutual understanding with them? In the long run, they will prevail, not the ruling Russian totalitarians.

IV. AN AMERICAN ASSIST TO RUSSIFICATION

The fourth objection to the treaty is that its provisions engender an American assist to Russification within and outside the U.S.S.R. The provision in the pact for the use of the Russian language to process the fictitious Soviet national is in every sense an inadvertent assist to the well-known Russification policies of Moscow.⁷ In effect, here too we would be buttressing Moscow's colonialist policy of enforcing the use of the captor's language among the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.

Here, too, before he casts his vote on the treaty it would do well for each Senator to scan another recent congressional study on cultural Russification and linguaclade in the U.S.S.R.⁸ Do we want to be placed in the position of confirming and abetting this vicious genocidal tendency further? It is bad enough that functional necessity compels us to accede to it on the ambassadorial level, though this could be rectified, too, by a diplomatic alternative of a more realistic nature.

With a premium on verbal generality Mr. Rusk and others argue for the treaty because

it would normalize relations. What are they seeking to normalize? The inner Soviet Russian Empire, Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism, or Moscow's Russification policies? The treaty would abnormally relate us to these ugly phenomena in the seeming position of even accepting them as normal. Aside from the essential factor of comparative advantage in the cold war, what a political posture we are asked to assume by ratifying this treaty. The nation of the American Revolution and all the perennial principles this implies is urged in the name of normalization to place stamps of diplomatic approval on the worst institutional hallmarks of its basic enemy. Also, what is most curious is that those who talk loudly today about the liquidation of the Communist monolith, growing nationalism in eastern Europe, a world of diversity, and good Communists and bad ones are normally those who, for whatever reasons, stop at the borders of the U.S.S.R., the determining inner empire itself, with these supposedly new notions.

¹ Murrey Marder, "U.S.-Soviet Treaty," the Washington Post, Aug. 20, 1965.

² Communication, Aug. 4, 1965.

³ "The Soviet Empire," Committee on the Judiciary, 1965, p. 166.

⁴ U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, memorandum to U.N. delegations, the United Nations, Nov. 25, 1961.

⁵ E.g. Consular Convention With the Soviet Union, pp. 8, 9, 10, etc.

⁶ Ibid. p. 11.

⁷ Ibid. p. 8.

⁸ See "Nations, Peoples, and Countries in the U.S.S.R.," study of population and immigration problems, House Committee on the Judiciary, 1964.

After the Moon, What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the National Observer of January 11, 1966, asks the question "After the Moon, What?" and goes on to describe the options that are available in our current space program and its extension into the applications of the Apollo system to projects which will give a tangible return for our investment in the manned space flight program. This article clearly summarizes the potential problems and the prospects in our manned space flight effort as this country strives to make full use of the vast capability that we have developed since 1958. The article, by Peter T. Chew, follows:

AFTER THE MOON, WHAT?—SPACEMEN AIM TO MAKE SPACE WORK PAY

(By Peter T. Chew)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—By means of James Bondian radio transmitters inserted in the hides of whales, earth-orbiting astronauts may one day track them and determine their global migration patterns.

With radar, astronauts may be able to locate and track icebergs, even through heavy cloud cover and fog.

And it is a certainty that manned spacecraft will increase tremendously man's knowledge of the sea in general—the "sea state," or the height and lengths of waves,

and of what directions the world's seas and currents are flowing at any given point in time. Astronauts may even be able to spot fish-feeding grounds with special cameras and other optical devices, and direct fishing fleets to them.

A FEW OF THE POSSIBILITIES

These are just a few of the ways that manned spacecraft may support oceanography alone, according to studies made for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) by the aerospace industry. Other studies envision astronauts producing worldwide agricultural, mineral, and fresh water surveys. Still other studies foresee manned communications satellites providing worldwide television coverage and serving as relay points for deep-space communications.

The aerospace industry hopes that such possibilities will answer the question: After the manned lunar landing, what?

Many space agency officials believe the United States must begin to answer the question this year. Otherwise, the enormous investment in manpower, launch vehicles, spacecraft, and ground facilities will "erode," as Robert C. Seamans, Jr., the Agency's Deputy Administrator, likes to put it.

In fiscal year 1967, which begins July 1, the Agency would like to make a downpayment on Saturn I-B launch vehicles and 3-man Apollo spacecraft for a 30-flight program that would begin in the summer of 1968 and run through the summer of 1972. The Apollo applications program, as it is called, would thus bracket the manned lunar landing itself, which is now expected to take place in the 1969-70 period.

Because the cost curve of the moon-landing program will start down as the huge Saturn rocket vehicles and custom-built Apollo space craft come on line, NASA believes it can conduct the applications program without exceeding the \$5 billion-plus that now appears to be the Agency's share of the annual national budget. Mr. Seamans hopes to divert a few of the 12 Saturn I-B's and 21 Apollo spacecraft from the lunar-landing program to the applications program if it appears they will not be needed for the lunar expedition.

The Apollo applications program would include manned earth-orbital missions of 45, 90, and 135 days, employing modified Apollo spacecraft and Saturn I-B rocket vehicles. With the larger 7.5 million-pound-thrust Saturn 5's, 3-man lunar-orbiting missions of 28 days' duration will be possible, as will lunar surface explorations of up to 2 weeks.

The Vietnam war having cast a pall of uncertainty over the Agency's budget request—NASA has asked for \$5.58 billion, which the Budget Bureau has reportedly pared to \$5.1 billion—officials are not eager to detail their Apollo applications plans. (Nor do you hear much blue-sky talk in NASA headquarters these days about manned Venusian "fly-bys," or \$60 billion manned expeditions to Mars.) When they do talk, they like to emphasize economy, and the practical results to be gained from earth-orbital missions.

"MODIFY WHAT WE HAVE"

"We plan to modify what we have and make do," says Mr. Seamans, the Agency's No. 2 man and overall program manager.

For example, the Apollo spacecraft can be modified to carry between 3,000 and 5,000 pounds of scientific and engineering experiments when flying manned earth-orbital missions. This will be possible because the spacecraft will not have to carry on such missions the heavy supplies required for the lunar flight.

Similarly, the Lunar Excursion Module or "LEM," which is part of the three-unit Apollo spacecraft, will also be able to tote sizable experiment payloads when flying in earth orbit. The LEM is that part of the spacecraft that is scheduled to disengage from the

Footnotes at end of speech.

lunar-orbiting unit and carry two of the three astronauts down to the lunar surface, then blast off and return them to the spacecraft again. In earth orbit, the LEM will not require its heavy lunar-landing legs and rocket array.

One particularly interesting mission under consideration involves a manned earth-orbiting astronomical observatory. On this mission, astronauts will fly their Apollo spacecraft into a synchronous orbit over the equator at a distance of 20,000-odd miles. In such an orbit, the spacecraft appears to hover over the same spot on earth because its orbital speed is relative to that of earth.

A TELESCOPIC VIEW

The LEM unit of the spacecraft would be equipped with a telescope, star trackers, television, and radio astronomy antennas. Once in orbit, an astronaut would adjust the instruments, and peer through the telescope. His view from this speeding platform, far removed from the atmospheric distortions that have bedeviled earthbound astronomers for centuries, will surely be fantastic.

The astronaut could remain aboard the LEM or, more likely, leave the LEM and return to the command unit of the Apollo spacecraft, which would then disengage from the LEM, allowing it to fly on alone in orbit. Later, astronauts could fly back to the orbiting LEM, rendezvous, dock, and go aboard again to check the instruments and make any necessary adjustments or repairs.

In order to conduct long-duration experiments in earth orbit, say NASA engineers, manned spacecraft will spell one another. One satellite crew might fly, for example, a communications or navigation satellite for 45 days, then a fresh crew in a similarly equipped spacecraft would rocket up and take over the duty for the next 45 days. And so on.

During the applications program, astronauts will undoubtedly engage in considerable "extravehicular activity," leaving their spacecraft on tether lines to inspect and repair the spacecraft, and to perfect astronaut rescue techniques.

SERVICING SATELLITES?

Perhaps the astronauts will rendezvous with, inspect, and repair faulty unmanned satellites that are already whizzing around the earth. Thought has been given to fitting the LEM with a long grappling hook with which to recover unmanned satellites.

There are, of course, a multitude of Russian unmanned satellites zipping through space over our heads. Certainly many of these satellites are of great interest to us, especially from a military standpoint, just as some of our unmanned satellites are of interest to the U.S.S.R.

This brings up the question of the U.S. Air Force's secret Manned Orbital Laboratory or "MOL" program, which in many ways would appear to be a costly duplication of the proposed Apollo applications program—or vice versa, depending upon one's viewpoint.

The Air Force plans to use the Titan III rocket vehicle to launch the MOL, which will consist of a modified Gemini spacecraft attached to a large cylindrical laboratory.

FUNDS ARE SLASHED

Defense Secretary McNamara recently gave the Air Force the nod to proceed with the program, which he has never been enthusiastic about. But MOL contractors now say that the Air Force's budget request for MOL has been deeply slashed in the upper, civilian reaches of the Pentagon, partly because of the spiraling costs of the Vietnam war. The schedule calls for the first MOL flight in 1968, when the first Apollo applications flights are expected to begin.

Since its sputnik-inspired birth in 1958, the space agency has enjoyed a charmed life with its budgets once they have reached Capitol Hill. The same appears to be true

this year, Vietnam notwithstanding. There are several reasons for this.

To begin with, Congressmen say that most of their constituents believe this country should have a vigorous space program. Secondly, the space program is, like the defense program, a political honey jar.

From the moment that Administrator James E. Webb assumed direction of NASA under the late President Kennedy he has distributed his agency facilities and contracts with finesse. In this manner, he has built a broad base of congressional support.

At the same time, Mr. Webb's Agency has distributed millions of dollars in research grants to universities, thus gaining another broad base of support. The intense criticism of NASA by non-NASA scientists has all but died out.

FEW WATCHDOGS

In the view of some objective observers of the space program, this situation has its unhealthy aspects. They say there are alarmingly few congressional watchdogs giving the space program a sharp going over.

A notable exception is Representative JOSEPH E. KARTH, a Minnesota Democrat on the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, who has led hardhitting investigations of NASA's Ranger, Centaur, and Surveyor programs. His recent investigation of the Surveyor lunar soft-landing program, for example, revealed that the program has fallen 2½ years behind schedule, while its original cost estimate of \$50 million has rocketed to \$350 million, and is certain to go higher. His conclusion: "Mismanagement was the prime culprit."

Mr. KARTH prefers to let his investigations speak for themselves and refuses to criticize his fellow Congressmen. But another Congressman, a Republican, says:

"The manned space-flight program doesn't get the scrutiny that Mr. KARTH gives the unmanned program. The Senate Space Committee, especially, acts like the Agency's protector rather than its overseer. But then I'm not a space booster. As I see it, NASA has created a gigantic monster, and now it's scurrying around like mad trying to justify its continued feeding."

This NASA-created "monster," as the rather extreme congressional critic prefers to call it, includes some 400,000 people in the 20,000 companies involved in the vast lunar-landing project.

CONTRACTORS' PROBLEMS

The major Apollo contractors such as North American Aviation, Chrysler, Boeing, Douglas, and Grumman, have invested untold millions of their own dollars in tailor-made facilities to support the lunar program. For the past 2 years they have been growing understandably edgy, waiting for NASA and Congress to commit themselves to post-Apollo planning.

"The Apollo Applications program should soothe their nerves," says one NASA man.

For now, the Agency plans a busy year of space flights. There will be five more two-man Gemini flights between now and the first of next year when the Saturn IB-Apollo program will begin with lunar-training flights in earth orbit. All the Gemini flights will involve rendezvous and docking with unmanned Agena rocket vehicles, plus extra-vehicular activity.

The unmanned program includes 29 flights, most notably the first Surveyor, Lunar Orbiter, and Orbiting Astronomical Observatory launches.

And it now appears that NASA is not going to wait much longer to get cracking on oceanographic research. Late last week NASA and the U.S. Naval Oceanographic office agreed to collaborate and define oceanographic experiments for Apollo Applications flights. "The photographs of the sea taken during the last few Gemini flights really opened peoples' eyes; they're fantastic," says one naval officer.

Boston College Sugar Bowl Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, 1966, the Boston College Varsity Club celebrated the 25th anniversary of their victory over Tennessee in the New Orleans Sugar Bowl of 1941. The guest speaker at the jubilee dinner was Msgr. George V. Kerr, who was a member of that championship squad. Monsignor Kerr has an outstanding record in the Archdiocese of Boston, and recently he was chosen by Sports Illustrated as one of the All-American selections who has succeeded in his chosen field.

The monsignor's talk that evening was most inspiring and I would like to quote him herewith:

In the name of the Sugar Bowl team, and in the name of Boston College, I'm very privileged to accept this goalpost symbolizing a high honor.

And yet any one of the members behind me are equal to the same. Of many accomplishments I have made none would be true without Boston College and its continual inspiration.

So really in the name of my teammates, and in Boston College, I thank Mark Mulvoy and Sports Illustrated for this participation in football and in life.

I don't know how Joe Zabliski feels tonight. But as for myself, if I had the chance to meet Ed Molinski and Augie Lio before the game, I'm almost positive that I'd never show up.

These two young men—Ed Molinski and Augie Lio—are two of the greatest guards ever produced in America. And it's a great privilege for Joe Zabliski and myself for having the honor to play against them as well as the great teammate of Molinski, Bob Suftridge of Tennessee.

As the spokesman for the Sugar Bowl team, I would like to quote a stoic philosopher of Rome, Epictetus, who once said something that bears true tonight, whether you talk of a team, statesman, or a life:

"Nothing great in this life is produced suddenly, any more than a bunch of grapes or a fig. If you ask for a fig, my answer to you, 'There must be time. First, let it blossom; then bear fruit; then ripen.'"

Under the ever-deft hand of a Ted Dalley, this Sugar Bowl team began to blossom in its freshman year.

And under the patient insistence of a great and venerable coach on fundamentals, Gail Dobie, this team began to bear fruit in varsity competition.

And then under the tree at Boston College that stood sentinel for so many years over old Alumni Field, the Sugar Bowl team began to ripen and it met for the first time a new and a young coach by the name of Frank Leahy.

And it didn't take this team long to know that this young man was a great teacher.

And it wasn't long before the lesson learned was to be hard but not heartless, to be tough but not toughs, and to be relentless but not ruthless.

It was essential at all times to be a gentleman, and perhaps the most characteristic quality of this new mentor was to the fact that he was a disciplinarian.

So were his assistant coaches—men of dedication, men who worked harder at times